

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V.

MAY, 1925.

No. 5.

“New Translations of the New Testament.”

W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

In a recent notice of Moffatt's new translation of the New Testament (THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, Vol. 3, 323 ff.) we ventured the suggestion that all these modern efforts to re-English the New Testament have a direct value only for professional men to whom the Bible is the tool of their craft, so to speak. Even these will have to use the new renderings with caution, always measuring them against the Greek original, the same as scholars must now do when ascertaining the adequacy of a rendering in the King James Version. The mere fact that the recent renderings are new, that they embody the respectable results of textual criticism, and enlist the increased knowledge of Greek that has become available through modern philology, does not put these renderings in a privileged class, does not confer on them the dignity of a *norma normans*, does not render them infallible. Every translation, no matter how apt it is, will be only *norma normata* from the dogmatic viewpoint. Caution in the use of the new versions, moreover, is necessary also for the reason that every translation, as a whole, is virtually a commentary, and in difficult passages, where the translation is almost a paraphrase, it becomes distinctly and consciously an interpretative effort. Now, each one of the new translations is the work of a single individual, not, as in the case, for instance, of the translation of 1611, the work of a number of men and the result of many conferences with their exchange and critical weighing of varying opinions. Objectivity in intellectual pursuits is a consummation devoutly to be wished for, but it is more than questionable whether it is ever attained. Absolute objectivity seems to be beyond the power of any human being. In any discriminating device from among a number of possibilities the deliberative operation of the mind is pushed into its goal and crystallizes in a decision through some subjective element that appeals to the author more than any other. This subjective element may be, and frequently is, congruent with an objective fact.

That is the happiest outcome, for in that case the subjective decision tallies with the objective fact, and the result is practically objective. But the other possibility always remains open, *viz.*, that the mind under a strong subjective impulse may deviate from the objective and its genuine meaning. *Ergo.*

An article in the *Journal of Religion* (March, 1924), under the caption at the head of this paper, by Frank Eakin, of the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh, concludes as follows: "Personally I entertain the notion — which possibly the translators themselves do not entertain — that these works will yield their greatest harvest of influence through their use by the student class. As *condensed practical commentaries* [Italics ours] they are invaluable, and, happily, serious students of the New Testament are making large use of them." To what extent the high opinion here expressed regarding the value of the new translations is true depends on the individual student. But in the body of his paper the author suggests a number of guide-lines by following which any one may arrive at a general evaluation of the new renderings.

To begin with, the new versions are *private* efforts and as such distinct from the *official* versions of 1611, 1881 (Revised Version), and 1901 (American Standard), which are the work of large and representative Protestant scholars and have gained recognition by their use in the pulpit, in church-schools, and in the private sanctuary — a distinction which none of the new translations enjoys nor is likely to enjoy for some time to come, if ever. The question is, Do the official translations fully answer the needs of the modern man? The author might have pointed out that the later official versions *ipso facto* argue the inadequacy of the former, or the later would not have been attempted at all. The scholars who prepared the Revised Version believed that they could improve upon the Authorized, and those who produced the American Standard were convinced that their work was better than that of their English colleagues. This observation applies, of course, with equal force to the various private translations: each translator thinks that his work meets the requirements of the age better than that of another. Looking at the situation from this angle, one is inclined to say that each translation, whether official or private, declares the preceding ones inadequate, and will, in turn, be declared inadequate by succeeding versions. This turns the question of adequacy into an endless chain.

Our author has a more practical way of arriving at a satis-

factory answer. He divides the "actual or potential users of the New Testament" into three classes: 1. church people in general; 2. scholars and students; 3. the general public without church affiliations. The King James Version is decidedly the great favorite with the first class, and because this class is universally stronger than the second, it is "overwhelmingly in the lead." The Revised Versions, in our country the American Standard, occupy a dominant position in colleges, universities, and seminaries, and, to a considerable extent, in Sunday-schools. The third group has no preference because it makes only a slight use of the New Testament in any form. The reasons for the greater love for the King James Version are "its classical English and its sacred associations." As regards the Revised Versions, they appeal to scholars because of their fidelity to "the greatly improved Greek text," and they are "remarkably literal" translations of that text. But these reasons are offset, as regards the King James Version, by these counter-reasons: the classical English of the seventeenth is not the English of the twentieth century, and — we would add — the Version of 1611 is admittedly faulty in quite a number of places. Accordingly, the use of this Version, says our writer, by "the rank and file of church people tends to foster and perpetuate a use of the Bible which is largely formal and which contributes very little to the realities of life." This assertion we consider an overstatement of the practical effects of the defects of the King James Version. It is remarkable what an immense amount of true enlightenment on every element of the true religion this version has afforded to a long line of generations of devout Christians, and what a power for good it has proved in their lives. The new versions have a great task before them if they are to raise a race of men as truly moral and religiously efficient as the old Version did. — As regards the Revised Versions, their very literalness has been procured at the sacrifice of idiomatic speech, which not infrequently requires a complete recasting of a Greek thought to give it a genuine English expression. — To reach the general public outside of the Church, a version would have to be presented that appeals to human interest by the manner in which the Biblical subject-matter is presented. In this the King James Version will always fail because of its peculiar English and its frequently insipid verse- and chapter-divisions. The removal of illogical verse- and chapter-divisions is a distinct merit of the new versions, and the paraphrasing — we might add, the distinctive type for citations and for poetry — appeal very much to the modern reader and aid

considerably in the mastering of the contents of the various writings.

It follows that none of the *official* versions is adequate for the modern reader. This might dispose of the contention sometimes heard in our own Synod that we are in a better position than other church-bodies to adopt the Revised Version, because our people have not become so firmly anchored to the Authorized Version as other church-bodies, which have for many generations used only the latter Version. Among us there is no version that has to be eradicated to give place to a new; we are planting in virgin soil. This contention assumes the absolute superiority of the Revised over the Authorized Version and overlooks the fact that the laymen, in particular, of our church-body, when using the Revised Version, would not be as easily understood by laymen of other church-bodies, who still cling to the Authorized Version, as the vast majority of them do. However, we do not wish to appear dogmatic by these animadversions and are open to conviction. Our writer remarks that saying the official versions are inadequate "is far from saying that they are valueless. There is no likelihood of their being displaced in our generation, and there is no need of their being displaced. [!] Fears on this score are groundless. But they should be supplemented that our equipment for the reading and study of the New Testament in English may be more complete."

The question now arises: Do the unofficial, or private, renderings furnish the desirable supplementary equipment for a truly beneficial reading of the New Testament? In our notice of Moffatt's Parallel Edition of the New Testament we limited our attention to only one of these private versions, and this notice was necessarily meager, not at all exhaustive. Dr. Eakin has examined five private versions: the Twentieth Century (1898—1904), Weymouth's (1902), Moffatt's (1913), Ballantine's (1923), and Goodspeed's (1923). Perhaps some of our professional Bible-scholars will furnish us with a critical review of one or the other of these translations, especially Goodspeed's. Our writer says: "The first two have had honorable careers of usefulness, but neither has wide use or great prestige at the present time. The case with Moffatt's translation is different. During the ten years following its appearance it gained steadily in the esteem of Bible-users on both sides of the Atlantic, so that, when in 1923 two new versions were put forth, — both of them American products, — Moffatt's was the one outstanding rival in the field." The last two most

recent translations our author subjects to a special examination, with frequent references to Moffatt's and occasional references to the two oldest unofficial translations.

We regret that we have not the space to exhibit *in extenso* the results of Dr. Eakin's examination; we can indicate them only in a general way. G. finds that the new versions contain 1. "changes in mechanical make-up":¹⁾ T. C. adopts a chronological order of the New Testament writings, placing Mark at the head of the gospels and giving First and Second Thessalonians the first place among the epistles of Paul. M. arranges matter which he thinks had become misplaced, for instance, John 15 and 16 are placed after chap. 13, 31. T. C. and W. use topic headings. T. C., M., and G. paragraph each unit in a conversation. All five use quotation-marks, but the amount of matter treated as quotation differs, for instance, in John 3 and Gal. 2, B. omits verse numbers, G. gives them at the bottom of the page. Their object is "to give the New Testament the appearance of a book to be 'continuously and understandingly read.'"²⁾

2. "Changes due to the progress of studies in the Greek New Testament": G. follows the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, B. that of Nestle, M. that of von Soden; but each departs occa-

1) For convenience' sake the five translations aforementioned are referred to by letters: T. C. = 20th Century, W. = Weymouth's, M. = Moffat's, B. = Ballantine's, and G. = Goodspeed's.

2) Dr. Eakin cites John Locke's († 1704) *Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by Consulting St. Paul Himself* to show that the revolt against the old divisions of the Bible is of long standing: "The dividing of them into chapters and verses, as we have done, whereby they are so chopped and minced, and as they are now printed, stand so broken and divided that not only the common people take the verses usually for distinct aphorisms, but even men of more advanced knowledge, in reading them, lose very much of the strength and force of the coherence and the light that depends on it. . . . These divisions also have given occasion to the reading these epistles by parcels and in scraps, which has farther confirmed the evil arising from such partitions. And I doubt not but every one will confess it to be a very unlikely way to come to the understanding of any other letters to read them piecemeal, a bit to-day and another scrap to-morrow, and so on by broken intervals. . . . How plain soever this abuse is, and what prejudice soever it does to the understanding of the Sacred Scripture, yet if a Bible was printed as it should be and as the several parts of it were writ, in continued discourse where the argument is continued, I doubt not but the several parties would complain of it as an innovation and a dangerous change in the publishing those holy books. . . . They would, most of them, be immediately disarmed of their great magazine of artillery wherewith they defend themselves and fall upon others, if the Holy Scripture were but laid before the eyes of Christians in its due connection and consistency."

sionally from his chosen norm. In 1 Pet. 3, 19 G. and M. adopt the suggestion of Rendel Harris "that through a scribe's blunder the name of Enoch has dropped out of the text." M. and G. substitute "laziness" for "disorderliness" in 2 Thess. 3, 6—15 and "all" for "both" in Acts 19, 16 (R. V.) and 23, 8. All the new versions show improvement in the translation of the Greek article and the Greek tenses, especially the aorist.

3. "Changes due to the use of English like that of our present, every-day speech": In Mark 15, 25 M., G., and B. translate "the third hour" by "nine in the morning," "an issue of blood" in Matt. 9, 20 by "hemorrhage," "wrest" in 2 Pet. 3, 16 by "twist," "publicans" in Matt. 9, 10 by "tax-gatherers" or "tax-collectors." G., as a rule, uses "God's people" for "saints," and "heathen" for "Gentiles." G. drops "thee" and "thou" entirely, while M. retains it in prayers, and B. seems to follow no principle. The American translators change Moffatt's British idiom in a number of places, for instance, "ears of corn" (Matt. 12, 1) to "heads of grain" (B.) or "heads of wheat" (G.); "farthing" (Matt. 10, 29) to "penny" (B.) or "cent" (G.); "got baptized" (Mark 1, 9) to "was baptized." Matt. 1, 18 in M. reads: "His mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph," in B.: "His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph," in G.: "Mary, his mother, was engaged to Joseph." Matt. 3, 4: "with a leather girdle round his loins" (M.), "wore a leather belt around his waist" (B.), "had a leather belt around his waist" (G.). Matt. 3, 7: "You brood of vipers" (M.), "Brood of vipers" (B.), "You brood of snakes" (G.). Matt. 4, 11: "and angels came up and ministered to Him" (M.), "and angels came and waited upon Him" (B.), "and angels came and waited on him." Matt. 6, 14: "For if you forgive men their trespasses" (M.), "For if you forgive men their wrong-doings" (B.), "For if you forgive others when they offend you." Matt. 6, 24: "You cannot serve both God and Mammon" (M.), "You cannot serve God and Mammon" (B.), "You cannot serve God and money" (G.). Matt. 7, 1: "Judge not that ye may not be judged yourselves" (M.), "Do not judge, so that you may not be judged" (B.), "Pass no more judgments upon other people, so that you may not have judgments passed upon you" (G.). Matt. 7, 6: "do not throw pearls before swine" (M.), "nor cast your pearls before swine" (B.), "do not throw your pearls before pigs" (G.). Matt. 7, 10: "Or, if he asks a fish, will you hand him a serpent?" (M.), "Or if he asks for a fish, will he give him a serpent?" (B.), "Or if he asks for a fish, will he give him a snake?" (G.) Mark 2, 3: "a paralytic . . . four

men carried him" (M.), "a paralytic, borne by four" (B.), "a man who was paralyzed, four of them carrying him" (G.). Mark 6, 11: "as a warning to them" (M. and G.), "as a testimony against them" (B.). John 14, 2: "In My Father's house there are many abodes" (M.), "In My Father's house are many abiding-places," (B.), "There are many rooms in My Father's house" (G.). Rom. 1, 7: "called to be saints" (M.), "called to be holy" (B.), "called to be His people" (G.). Gal. 5, 13: "do not make your freedom an opening for the flesh" (M.), "do not let your freedom be an opportunity for the flesh" (B.), "do not make your freedom an excuse for the physical" (G.). 2 Pet. 3, 1. 8. 14. 17: "be-loved" (M.), "dear friends" (G.).

4. "Changes looking to the better rendering of thought especially through the freer rendering of words": In Mark 12, 10 "the head of the corner" becomes "the chief stone of the corner" (B.), "the corner-stone" (G.). John 2, 17: "Zeal for thy house will devour me" (B.), "My zeal for your house will consume me" (G.). Gal. 3, 2—4 reads thus in G.: "You senseless Galatians! . . . This is all I want to ask you: Did you receive the Spirit through doing what the Law commands or through believing the message you heard? Are you so senseless? Did you begin with the Spirit only to end now with the flesh? Have you gone through so much, all for nothing?—if it really is for nothing!" Jas. 5, 16: "The effective prayer of a righteous man has great power" (B.), "The prayers of a righteous man have a powerful effect" (M.), "An upright man can do a great deal by prayer when he tries" (G.), etc. In 1 Cor. 7, 36—38 "his virgin" becomes "his spiritual bride" in M. and "the girl to whom he is engaged" in G. The changes in this class are the most important of all; for here the new versions, in their efforts to remove ambiguities and obscure phrases and to express the thought rather than the words of the original, become interpreters pure and simple and show plainly that their work must be classified as commentary. At this point, too, the question of the adequacy of the new translations will be largely decided. It will be found that at best these new versions may serve as supplements to the old translation. Dr. Eakin thinks that they will induce a more general and intelligent use of the Bible by men of culture, and that they will "shock hardened Bible-readers out of their conception of the New Testament as a codification of doctrinal and ethical precepts" by showing them that the New Testament is rather "a collection of writings which throb with the life of primitive Christianity." If the new versions were

to accomplish this, that would be a great gain; but it is doubtful whether they will. The natural mind of man is too much averse to studying God's Word in any form. It were well, however, if natural man were deprived of the specious argument against Bible-reading, *viz.*, that one cannot get any sense out of it anyway. Bible-students should treat the new versions just as they treat any other Bible-commentary, *viz.*, as aids to the full understanding of Scripture and will apply to the use of these versions the apostolic rule in 1 Thess. 5, 21.

St. John's Church in Catawba Co., N. C., One Hundred and Twenty-Five Years Old.

CARROLL O. SMITH, Conover, N. C.

(Continued.)

II. Joins Tennessee Synod.

At first St. John's Church belonged to no ecclesiastical body; there was none anywhere in the South with which it could have affiliated. The first attempt to bring the various scattered German churches into any kind of an ecclesiastical union was made in South Carolina on November 13, 1787. (See Rev. Dr. Hazelius's *Hist. of the American Luth. Church*, pp. 118—121.) This organization was made up of both Lutheran and German Reformed ministers, together with lay delegates from both denominations, and bore the all-embracing names of *Corpus Evangelicum* and *Unio Ecclesiastica*—you may take your choice! (Two denominations—two names!) The constitution of this *Corpus*, signed by three Lutheran and by two Reformed ministers and fourteen delegates, is a wonderful document. Art. II states that "it is not to be understood that any member of either confession should forsake his confession, but that Lutherans and Reformed . . . who have hitherto united in the attendance on worship shall continue to enjoy the same rights and privileges, without the least reproach in consequence of their respective confessions"; and yet Art. III says: "Under the general superintendence of this directory all affairs relating to churches shall be judged and regulated; as, for instance, the reception and dismissal of preachers, their election, examination, ordination, and induction, the establishment and regulation of churches and schools"! Imagine Reformed ministers examining a young man to see whether he was well enough indoctrinated to become a pastor in the Lutheran Church and then

helping to ordain him! And worse still, imagine Lutheran ministers doing that in the case of some young man who wanted to become a pastor in the Reformed Church! Of course, it may have been of advantage to the young man; if he failed to make the one, he still might make the other denomination! Art. VIII: "Wherever the major part of the members of a congregation should belong to the Reformed Church, such liturgy, formula, and catechism are to be used as the Reformed Church in the Palatinate or Switzerland makes use of; but where the divine service has hitherto been performed according to the ceremonies of the Lutheran Church, the Wurttemberg or Halle formula shall be adopted. The Marburg hymn-book, in its second edition, remains in use in our churches of both confessions."(!) Space forbids further quotation from this interesting and accommodating constitution. The modern Lutheran with unionistic tendencies might study it with benefit, both with regard to its contents and its results — the *Unio Ecclesiastica* soon ceased to exist! It is a Utopian dream to expect a union of all denominations in this world, and every attempt to effect a union of this kind must finally fail. As regards the results of this *Corpus Evangelicum*, Dr. G. D. Bernheim (*Hist. of the Luth. Church in the Carolinas*) says that by 1803 "prose-lyting sects were only too industriously engaged in gathering the scattered members of our churches into their folds, and some once flourishing German congregations became irretrievably lost to the Church of their fathers. The only survivor of the *Corpus Evangelicum* was the Rev. Frederick Joseph Wallern; . . . and as far as the German Reformed Church is concerned, it had then almost ceased to exist." (p. 360.)

The next attempt to form an ecclesiastical body of the German Lutherans of the South was made in North Carolina. It was a nearer approach to a truly Lutheran body; none but pastors of Lutheran churches belonged to it, and the Augsburg Confession was its doctrinal basis. The name of this organization is The North Carolina Synod, the third oldest synod in America, formed in May, 1803, by four ministers of North Carolina.

St. John's first synodical connection was with this North Carolina Synod. It remained in this synod until 1820, when the Tennessee Synod was formed, although, most likely, it did not join the Tennessee Synod until 1824, as we shall attempt to show a little later.

Here we naturally ask this question, Why did St. John's withdraw from the North Carolina Synod? The answer is, To save

itself from the doctrinal shipwreck toward which the North Carolina Synod was rapidly steering. The North Carolina Synod had not begun on any too firm a Lutheran doctrinal foundation. But if the foundation was not rightly laid, the superstructure which was being erected on that uncertain foundation was even more dangerous for the faith of those who might make their spiritual home within its walls.

In 1810 the North Carolina Synod met in session at Organ Church, Rowan County, N. C. At this meeting one G. Schober was ordained and at once elected secretary of the synod. This man Schober was a member of the Moravian Church and continued to be a member of that Church all his life, although he was here ordained by Lutheran pastors to be the pastor of Lutheran congregations — and was their pastor for a number of years. That was sowing the evil seed, and those who were sowing it should have known what the harvest would be.

During the sessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, six years later (1816), it was resolved that the secretary (Rev. Schober still secretary!) “compile all the rules adopted by this synod and publish them in the English language.” In accordance with this resolution the secretary, the next year, laid before the synod a manuscript compilation with the high-sounding title: “Comprehensive Account of the Rise and Progress of the Blessed Reformation of the Christian Church, by Dr. Martin Luther, actually begun on the 31st day of October, A. D. 1517; interspersed with views of his character and doctrine, extracted from his books; and how the Church, established by him, arrived and progressed in North Carolina — as also the Constitution and Rules of that Church, in North Carolina and adjoining States, as existing in October, 1817.” If Rev. Schober ever thought that anybody would call his book by that name, he was mistaken, for it later went by the simple name “Luther.” This book contains a translation of twenty-one articles of the Augsburg Confession, a translation which, according to Dr. B. M. Schmucker, was made, with all its omissions and notes, by Dr. E. L. Hazellius, who was a graduate of the Moravian Theological Seminary at Niesky and, for a time, classical teacher at Nazareth, a Moravian institution of learning in Pennsylvania, later professor at Hartwick Seminary, and finally at Gettysburg Seminary. In the Tenth Article the word *true* is omitted, “and the article is accompanied with a footnote which perverts the true sense and so modifies it as to make it acceptable to the various denominations; and so, too, in regard to

the Eleventh Article. Really, the translation is very defective." (Henkel, *Hist. of the Ev. Luth. Tenn. Synod.*) "Its general tone and tenor are compromising and unionistic, with a tendency to latitudinarianism and looseness in doctrine, rather ignoring the true Confessions of the Church and disparaging her distinctive features, with a view to a general fraternal union with the different denominations." (*Ibid.*)

On page 210 Rev. Schober says: "I have attentively examined the doctrine of the Episcopal Church and read many excellent authors of the Presbyterians, know the Methodist doctrine from their book *Portraiture of Methodism*, and am acquainted with the Baptist doctrine so far as they admit and adore Jesus the Savior. Among all those classes who worship Jesus as God I see nothing of importance to prevent a cordial union; and how happy it would be if all the churches could unite and send deputies to a general meeting of all denominations and there sink down upon the rock Jesus, at the same time leaving to each their peculiar mode and form," etc.

On pages 211 and 212 he says: "I think my sentiments are as orthodox and Calvinistical as need be, and yet I am a sort of speckled bird among my Calvinist brethren. I am a mighty good churchman, but pass among such as a Dissenter in *prunello*. On the other hand, the Dissenters, many of them I mean, think me defective, either in understanding or in conscience, for staying where I am. Well, there is a middle party, called the Methodists, but neither do my dimensions exactly fit them; I am somehow disqualified for claiming a full brotherhood with any party; but there are a few among all parties who bear with me and love me, and with this I must be content at present."

Of a hymn-book, called *Gemeinschaftliches Gesangbuch*, intended for the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, published by Scheafer and Maud, of Baltimore, he says in his "Luther" book: "This meritorious undertaking paves the way to universal harmony, union, and love among all our Lutheran and Reformed Churches, removing all the obstacles which hitherto prevented that happy effect, and establishes a uniformity in that part of divine worship which cannot fail to be highly gratifying to all those who consider brotherly love an indispensable attribute of Christianity."

The secretary of a Lutheran synod writing such stuff! A Lutheran synod becoming responsible for the publication and dissemination of such a work as that; for "an amount of money sufficient to pay for printing and binding 1,500 copies of the work,

at a cost of 75 cents a copy, was taken out of the treasury"! It takes no great stretch of imagination to see where the North Carolina Synod was headed for.

If the imagination needs something more to see the un-Lutheran drift of the North Carolina Synod, then here it is. The records of this same meeting of the synod which ordained Schober and elected him secretary (at Organ Church, in 1810), contain the following: "On motion of Rev. Philip Henkel it was resolved that, inasmuch as awakenings arise in our days by means of three days' preaching, and the like is to be wished among our brethren in the faith, a trial of such preaching be made, with the proviso that three ministers of our connection hold these meetings, to which also ministers of the Moravian and Reformed Churches, whether German or English, be welcomed; at each of these meetings the Communion is to be administered." The time was then set for holding these meetings in the various congregations. This means that right then and there the North Carolina Synod had begun to imitate Pietism-Methodism by trying to bring men into the church by the door of revivals and the "mourners' bench." Since that day it has been hard, at times and in some places, to tell by its practise whether the North Carolina Synod is a Lutheran synod, a Moravian brotherhood, or a Methodist conference; nor has the synod washed its garments entirely clean from these un-Lutheran stains even to this day.

However, in Staunton, Va., May 4, 1795, there was born a son of the Rev. Paul Henkel, who was destined, in God's hands, to stand like a tower of strength against this evil foe of unionism which was threatening to overwhelm the Lutheran Church in Western North Carolina and the surrounding territory. That son became the Rev. David Henkel, practically a self-made man, but, at the same time, the best-informed young man who had applied for ordination in the North Carolina Synod up to, and including, his day. He knew the Lutheran doctrine, and he had the courage to preach the Lutheran doctrine. On an occasion one of these religion-is-love pastors told the Rev. David Henkel that he was not preaching correct doctrine. He defended himself with a translation from his Latin *Book of Concord*. His opponent charged that he had made an incorrect translation. By chance he came across a German translation of the *Book of Concord*. This showed that his translation was correct. This opened the eyes of some laymen. The church council of Henkel's opponent met to discuss the matter with their pastor. One member of the council presented the *Book*

of *Concord* to his pastor and said, "We want to know whether you are going to preach according to this book in the future." The minister tried to evade the question. But the council would have no evasion. Finally he picked up the *Book of Concord*, and bringing it down on the table, said, "From this day henceforth I will not; it is nothing but a controversial book." Then the elder immediately picked up the book and brought it down on the table with the statement, "From this day henceforth you won't be our preacher!"

Soon there were two parties: the unionistic, new-measure party and the strict, confessional party. It wanted but a start, and the North Carolina Synod would have been torn asunder. The start came in form of a question about the time for holding the sessions in 1820. The end of it was that the liberal, unionistic, we-are-all-brethren element remained to carry on the work of the North Carolina Synod along its lines, while the strict, true, confessional Lutheran element organized the Tennessee Synod.

St. John's stood by the confessions of her Church. She did not want union without unity. She knew that she could not walk with those with whom she was not agreed. Therefore there was but one thing for her to do, and that she did — she withdrew from the North Carolina Synod.

However, there seems to be some reason to believe that she did not join the new Tennessee Synod till 1824. The records show that in 1814 the pastor, Philip Henkel, was called to the State of Tennessee and that the Rev. Daniel Moser became his successor. In 1824 the Tennessee Synod met in Keinadt's (Coyner's) Congregation in the Valley of Virginia. The records of that meeting contain the following: "... 2) Rev. Daniel Moser, Lincoln County" (part of which is now Catawba County), "North Carolina, having expressed a desire to be received into connection with this synod, and a petition, number six, signed by members of three of his congregations . . . , certifying that since 1820 neither they nor their minister belonged to any synod, and asking to be received into Synod, . . . it was resolved that he and his congregations be received, and that he be recognized as one of its pastors." Again, in the parochial report of this same session we find these words: "Rev. Daniel Moser, *since 1820*, baptized 350 infants and one adult and confirmed 121." At any rate, St. John's was a member of the Tennessee Synod in 1825, because the sessions of the Synod were held in St. John's, beginning on September 5, 1825.

(To be concluded.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Modern psychology of the behaviorist persuasion has been applied by Behaviorist Dr. John B. Watson, formerly Professor of Psychology at Johns Hopkins University. This is what he has found after experimenting for ten years with 1,000 infant children: "There is no evidence to support the determined belief of most psychologists that man is born with the instinct of fear (in the shapes it commonly assumes), love, emulation and rivalry, pugnacity, anger, resentment, sympathy, hunting, appropriation, acquisitiveness, kleptomania, constructiveness, play, curiosity, sociability, shyness, cleanliness, modesty, jealousy, and parental love. (This is the famous list compiled by William James.) All these, it seems, are learned. More concretely, no one is born with such things as consciousness, mental states or complexes, will, imagination, and all their complementary sensations. No one is born with special talents or genius, Dr. Watson maintains. We do not think with the mind alone, but with the whole body, and especially with the vocal cords. There is no scientific evidence available to prove that the white infant is instinctively superior to the black, yellow, or brown infant. Neither is there any scientific evidence to support the view that a child born of Nordic parents is instinctively superior at birth to the Slav, Semitic, or Latin child." (Louis Kalonymy in *New York Times*, quoted in *Current Opinion*, March). Man is simply organized living matter and morally a blank. This psychology is to dominate our modern education. The results it is not difficult to forecast. DAU.

The anticlerical situation in France is thus summed up for *Current History* (February) by Prof. William Stearns Davis, of the University of Minnesota: "The strife over the anticlerical attitude of the Ministry had been comparatively dormant during November, but in December it flared up again in a somewhat violent manner. In the Chamber M. Herriot and his colleagues charged that the Royalists and the Clericals were deliberately exaggerating the seriousness of the Communist peril in order to divert attention from their own dangerous intrigues. The Catholic demonstrations in Brittany at Quimpar and elsewhere 'in defense of religious liberty,' were followed by great public meetings in other parts of France. On December 15, 15,000 persons assembled at Avignon, under the presidency of no less a personage than General de Castelnau, to adopt a resolution demanding the retention of the French Embassy at the Vatican, respect for the promises made to Alsace-Lorraine, freedom for all religious congregations, and the abolition of all laws limiting the rights and freedom of Catholics. At Bordeaux, at the same time, four Catholic meetings were held simultaneously, and were also attended by a total of about 15,000 people. Here appeals were made by deputies from many departments addressed to 'public opinion,' in order, said the speakers, 'that France might be spared domestic strife prejudicial to the dignity and safety of the country.'" This account favors the Catholic side, inasmuch as it says very little about the

anticlerical demonstrations which have been just as numerous as the clerical. James H. Ryan, in the (Catholic) *Commonweal* (February 4), calls what is happening just now "the French *Kulturkampf* of 1925." The designation has been chosen advisedly. The Catholic hierarchy aims at overcoming the handicaps created for its Church in France by the French laws which drove thousands of her priests from the country and led to the confiscation of millions of dollars of property. It had been hoped that the Catholic Church would be restored to popular favor when 8,000 exiled priests during the late war returned to "their beloved France," joined the colors, lost 1,464 killed in battle, and had 2,565 of their number decorated for heroic acts of bravery. The expectation was not realized, and now the hierarchy is plainly bent on effecting the downfall of the Herriot ministry and placing some one like Poincaré at the helm. Not a few American papers have expressed the sentiment that Herriot signed his political death-warrant when he opposed the aggressive French clergy. The sentiment is plainly inspired. There is even talk of civil war. In this connection Mr. Ryan, who is a member of the faculty of the Catholic University at Washington, expresses this sentiment: "According to our settled viewpoint the law must be the same for all; neither should it molest any one for his religious opinions. We look upon religious persecution at the present day as out of harmony with our philosophy of the equality of all men before the law and with the impartial treatment which should characterize every government in its relation with its subjects." This is indeed sound philosophy and good statecraft. Moreover, Catholics always score a point against their persecutors in a country which has adopted the principle of religious freedom when they appeal to their covenant rights. But the philosophy which Mr. Ryan endorses has not been adopted by those who have framed the doctrines of his Church and seen to their application. It is the belief of the Roman Catholic Church that no religious opinions other than her own have a right to exist. Toleration, religious equality, with the Roman Church, is not a principle, but merely a polity to be endured under pressure.

DAU.

Regarding the cinema, E. Haldeman-Julius, "runner-up to H. C. Mencken as an iconoclast," has this to say: "The silent—the dumb—drama! It is dumb, in any valid artistic sense, for the simple reason that it has nothing to say, absolutely nothing! One is struck by the fact that the products of this tremendous world of effort—tremendous in size, machinery, and display—are so trifling. There is no hint of greatness; no challenge, no promise, no gesture of real art. There is no intelligent minority of artists to dispute the supremacy of popular favorites. In the movie world there is the complete, unrelieved spectacle of flatness. Sham is king in a dull and tawdry world, the sham of falsifying life, of feeding the crowd with moldy ideas and mildewed sentimentalities, old tales, old plots, old situations. The movies have given the pot-boiler a world of his own."

DAU.

"Religion's Raid on the Radio" is the subject of Armstrong Perry's article in a recent issue of *Popular Radio*. "One out of every fourteen broadcasting stations in the United States is to-day owned or operated by a church," says a reviewer of the article in *Current Opinion* (March). "These stations are used, directly or indirectly, for propaganda by the various religious sects, while scores of other 'special' broadcasting stations are owned and operated by institutions under the control of religious bodies. . . . A prominent divine in New York has announced plans for opening a station that will blanket the metropolitan district and a good deal of other territory and seems to have taken as his slogan, 'Listen to me or to nothing.' . . . Some stations are using all the power the law will allow and operating all day long and into the night. . . . Complaints from listeners on Staten Island have been published in the newspapers and are to the effect that WBBR, operated by the People's Pulpit Association, transmits daily and blankets the whole island. The association is composed of followers of the late 'Pastor' Russell. Los Angeles fans complain of religious propaganda that crowds out programs they would rather hear; and around Zion City, Ill., there have been complaints that, in Mr. Perry's view, are but feeble forerunners of the storm that may arise when Voliva opens up with his new five-kilowatt transmitter, one of the most powerful used in the world for broadcasting." Mr. Perry himself remarks: "It is bad enough to have different religious denominations preaching and working against each other, all in the name of the same God, within the walls of their own meeting-houses. In that case we do not have to listen to them unless we choose to. But if they get to competing in the air, we broadcast listeners will be out of luck. Already the Fundamentalists and their opponents have had their fling in the ether, and a large part of listening America had a bad attack of spiritual nausea. So long as power is limited so that a propagandizing station can be tuned out, the situation is tolerable. The radio manufacturer and dealer especially are not averse to a condition that requires a high degree of selectivity in receiving-sets. But when a broadcaster acquires a right to radiate an amount of power that will force oscillations in all receivers within five, ten, or fifty miles, for any number of hours he may choose to monopolize the ether, he will have reached the ideal of the religious fanatic and the point where the average listener will junk his receiving-instrument." In the absence, so far, of laws regulating broadcasting the adjustment of rights and claims of broadcasters is in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. Since the publication of Mr. Perry's article the Roman Catholic Church has entered the radio field. "Cardinal Hayes, it seems, is behind the move, and the Paulist Fathers are to do the pioneer work in connection with the installation of powerful broadcasting stations not only in New York City, but also in Chicago and San Francisco. These stations will be 'for the purpose of acquainting the public with the Catholic viewpoint upon current affairs.'" The nuisances noted should be abated. But aside from

that, the natural enmity of the human heart to the preaching of God's Word is not lessened by the Gospel's being transmitted through the air. The narrow way is just as narrow over the radio as otherwise. We must be prepared for opposition to our radio preaching. It would be a wonder if the opposition would not come. DAU.

A White Raven. — "God is ready to forgive the sinner. The Bible leaves no doubt as to His willingness. The problem is, How can He justify the man who has broken His Law? It is a moral question with God. The majesty of the Law must be upheld, and justice must be satisfied. The penalty must be executed, either upon the sinner or a substitute, that will satisfy the demands of justice and secure obedience. Christ is God's solution of the problem. 'For He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.'" The speaker was Rev. William R. Dodd, who spoke at the Cote Brillante Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, on the theme, "How Can a Man be Just with God?" (*Globe-Democrat*, February 27.) It is heartening to a Lutheran to note that the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction is found in Scripture by non-Lutherans if they will but repeat what Scripture says. The majority of the nominally Christian teachers of our day reprobate this doctrine as too judicial and non-ethical. DAU.

An uneasy feeling prevails in conservative theological circles whenever the doctrine of the plenary verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is under discussion and theologians address themselves to the task of declaring their exact position on this doctrine. To most of them it is plainly a most unpleasant task, and when they are through with their "exact" statement, it is not easy to say just what is exact in the statement. The distinction in the sounds is such that it is impossible to say what has been piped or harped. 1 Cor. 14, 7. Some speak of degrees or modes of inspiration; others predicate inspiration of the whole of Scripture, but not of all its parts; still others present a list of reservations, on which you will find the cud-chewing conies, the genealogical tables, the astronomy of Joshua, the remarks of Satan, Moses' account of his own death and burial, the "not I, but the Lord" and "I, not the Lord" of Paul in 1 Cor. 7, 10, 11, and ever so many other items. In his lecture at Bergen, Norway, Prof. Odland, according to accounts in *Kristeligt Dagblad* of Copenhagen (January 31 and February 3), operated with items like these: The first nine chapters of First Chronicles are meaningless to most readers of the Bible; 2 Tim. 3, 16 refers only to the Old Testament; the four evangelists give contradictory accounts of the same event; in 1 Cor. 1, 16 Paul himself expresses uncertainty regarding a question of fact; there are many variant readings, etc. Modernists are watching this uncertainty of conservatives with keen interest and unconcealed delight; they regard it as a practical justification of their own radical standpoint. They claim that as between Conservatives and Liberals the plainness and honesty of utterance on the inspiration of the Bible is with the latter, and that the Modernist views are everywhere in triumphant progress. Dr. Salem G. Bland

said in the *Toronto Star* (January 24): "The modern view of the Scriptures certainly is prevailing. I question whether there is a theological college of standing in the United States or Canada where it is not more or less fully taught. If a Modernist is driven out for his frankness, he is replaced by a Modernist who is less known or has been more discreet. It is held by the vast majority of all educated ministers and, with scarcely any exceptions, by all ministers who have been educated at reputable theological colleges during the last twenty years." He also points to the picture which Mrs. Mason in *The High Way* paints of "the anguish which introduction of the modern study of the Bible works among theological students." Over against this unrest Catholics glory in their mental repose and attitude of indifference to all such troublesome questions: "The Catholic believes that all the Bible means is true, and that the Church is the interpreter of what the Bible means." (*The Commonwealth*, February 18.) All of which means that the position of those who cling to the doctrine of the plenary verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is being rendered increasingly difficult. It is not at all a new situation, it is only rendered unusually acute. But the objections raised against the inspired character of every word of the Bible with which the believers are being harassed now have all been raised before. What the defenders of the plenary verbal inspiration hold is this: Every word of Scripture was recorded by the holy writer under an impulse of the Holy Spirit, also the speeches of Satan, the personal advice of St. Paul, his indifferent memory of a certain incident. These are recorded as facts. The zoological, astronomical, and similar statements, the ἐναντιοφαινόμενα in the gospel accounts may present difficulties, but difficulties are not impossibilities. These things have been in the Scriptures throughout the ages and not only the rude and simple, but the most learned people in the world have read them without having their faith in the Bible as God's Word disturbed. After all arguments against the divine origin of Scripture have been advanced, the believer still will declare: I cannot surrender my faith in this Book, because I have drawn my conviction of its divine origin from the Book itself. Such a declaration is not stubbornness, bigotry, narrow-mindedness, but the exact truth. Here is the old marvel and mystery of faith: assurance of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures will never be plucked from the hearts of all men. Let the assailants of the plenary inspiration explain this phenomenon.

DAU.

Questionable methods for raising money for the church were criticized by Dr. Bird S. Coler, Commissioner of Public Welfare, in an address at the annual meeting of the New York Inner Mission Society. "Beware," he said, "of those who try to inculcate morality without religion; but beware also of those who try to do charity without religion!" He went on to describe how he had "put a stop to the 'block party,' invented during war-time, where a street is shut off and in the name of charity a public dance and games of chance are run. He declared that one half of the unmarried mothers of

two years ago were the result of these carnivals, many of which were run in the name of a church. Professional gamblers go from carnival to carnival with their doll-booths, wheels of fortune, and the like. They take about 90 per cent. of the income, and the large amounts raised for charity by their games only testify to the highly profitable character of their business. Mr. Coler has the courage of his convictions as proved by the action of his department in the case of the Park Ave. Fair. This is a society charity affair, and when he put his foot down as to the character of their money-raising methods, great influences were brought to bear upon him to make an exception. He insisted that what was law on the East Side was law also on Park Ave. He incidentally remarked that the same thing applied to prohibition enforcement. Make the 'higher-ups' behave, and you will have no trouble with the common folks. Even some Lutheran churches should publicly subscribe to the doctrine of the Jesuits, 'The end justifies the means.' 'Please buy a ticket on this radio set; it is only 10 cents.' 'Yes, my dear young lady, but it is against the law to raffle.' 'Oh, I know, but this is for a CHURCH.'" (Johanus Broenk, in the *Lutheran*, February 19.)

DAU.

The Real State of Controversy.—Some time ago Dr. Charles R. Erdman, of Princeton, published in the *Presbyterian Advance*, a Liberal paper, a disguised attack upon Dr. Machen, his colleague at Princeton. In this letter he endeavors to vindicate himself against the charge of rationalism and asserts that he is in full harmony with the evangelical faith. He writes: "You intimate that a division exists in the seminary faculty. No such division exists on points of doctrine. Every member of the faculty is absolutely loyal to the standards of our Church. The only division I have observed is as to spirit, methods, or policies. This division would be of no consequence were it not for the unkindness, suspicion, bitterness, and intolerance of those members of the faculty who are also editors of the *Presbyterian*. The serious aspect of your article is that it reflects their moral temper and their modes of thought and embodies the spirit by which the *Presbyterian* at present is controlled. Your spirit is that of unfairness, of fanaticism, of suspicion, and faction. Your evident purpose is to disrupt the Presbyterian Church. You are succeeding only in dividing its evangelical forces. The great majority of Presbyterians are sane and sound and conservative. They are certain to repudiate your statements, disavow your aims, and deplore your spirit. As far as I venture to interpret the mind of the Presbyterian Church, it believes in contending for the faith, but only by constitutional methods and in a spirit of charity. While actual rationalism is undisguised and rampant, this is no time for evangelical Christians to divide. May God be merciful to any one who now fails to strive, not only for the purity, but also for the peace and prosperity of our beloved Church!"

To this letter Dr. Machen wrote a noble reply, in which he states: "Dr. Erdman says that no division exists in the faculty of Princeton Seminary on 'points of doctrine.' That assertion I hold to be not

altogether correct. There is between Dr. Erdman and myself a very serious doctrinal difference indeed. It concerns the question, not of this doctrine or that, but of the importance which is to be attributed to doctrine as such. Dr. Erdman's answer to this basal question has been, so far as it can be determined by his public actions, the answer of doctrinal indifferentism. In 1920 he supported the Plan of Organic Union, which attempted to unite our Church with other churches on the basis of the vague language of modern naturalism and to relegate to the realm of the unessential our historic Confession of Faith. In 1924 he assumed a similar attitude when he consented to be the candidate of the indifferentist party (and also of the more outspoken Modernists) for Moderator of the General Assembly. The platform of that party was plainly indicated by Dr. John Timothy Stone in his nominating speech. 'We need a moderator,' Dr. Stone said (see the *Presbyterian Advance* for May 29, 1924), 'who stands for presenting a united front rather than the encouragement of controversy.' That was said in a great crisis, when agnostic Modernism, as represented by Dr. Fosdick and his Presbyterian supporters, was contending against Christianity for the control of our Church. It was upon such a platform that Dr. Erdman consented to stand. The issue between the two candidates for moderator was a great issue of principle—it was the issue between the doctrinal indifferentism which holds that 'Modernists' and 'Conservatives' both have a place in the ministry of our Church, and the constitution of the Church, which grounds Christian life upon the system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith and derived from the Word of God. . . . Dr. Erdman differs radically from me; and it is a great mistake to call the difference merely one of method or of spirit. On the contrary, it is a difference of principle of the most thoroughgoing kind. Dr. Erdman does not indeed reject the doctrinal system of our Church, but he is perfectly willing to make common cause with those who do reject it, and he is perfectly willing on many occasions to keep it in the background. I, on the other hand, can never consent to keep it in the background. Christian doctrine, I hold, is not merely connected with the Gospel, but it is identical with the Gospel, and if I did not preach it at all times, and especially in those places where it subjects me to personal abuse, I should regard myself as guilty of sheer unfaithfulness to Christ. It is, I hold, only as He is offered to us in the Gospel, that is, in the 'doctrine' which the world despises, that Christ saves sinful men; and never will I create the impression that there can be Christian prayer or Christian service except on the basis of those redeeming facts which are now called in question by a large party in our Church. I can pray with all my heart *for* those who come to God otherwise than through the blood of Christ, *but never can I pray WITH them.* The Gospel, I am well aware, is unpopular in many places in the Church, and many are the voices which would have us keep silent about it and engage in a non-doctrinal and non-controversial type of preaching, which shall be more palatable to the world. But I, for my part, cannot hearken. The Gospel has been given to me by God in His Word; and never, in order to win

the favor of men, will I in my preaching abate one whit of the searching insistence and solemnity of its appeal. On the contrary, despite the abuse to which it subjects me, and despite any sacrifice of 'influence' which it may involve, I hope by God's help to continue to preach in all its fulness, and with all its implications, polemical and otherwise, the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ as it is set forth in the Word of God and contained in our Confession of Faith. If that be 'fanaticism,' I am ready to make the most of it. It is because Dr. Erdman does not understand how deep is this difference of principle between us that he attributes to personal bitterness the opposition to his policy which I have felt obliged to maintain. As a matter of fact, all the other differences — differences of method, of ecclesiastical policy, and the like — proceed with absolute necessity from the one deep-seated difference to which I have referred."

MUELLER.

Divide and Conquer. — Some large congregations which have passed the thousand mark might learn a useful lesson from the bees. They should swarm. They should establish missions in other parts of the city. It is not possible for one pastor, even if he has a deaconess to assist him, to do justice to so large a flock. He cannot keep them healthfully active. That is why the smaller congregations are, as a rule, more efficient per member. It is far more easy to keep aloof from real telling work and to shirk responsibility in a large than in a small congregation. Besides, every congregation in a growing town or city owes both to itself and to the Church at large a duty which it cannot shirk without proving itself unfaithful. It must function as a missionary leaven in the community where it lives and works. In nearly every large city where the Lutheran Church is represented the Lutheran membership would to-day be two or three times larger than it is, had some of the older congregations swarmed and established missions in the growing sections. (*The Lutheran*, February 19.)

DAU.

At Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" Dr. Henry Eyster Jacobs of Mount Airy Seminary was present. He relates: "Every eye and ear was strained as the President arose, a majestic figure in all the stateliness of his office, and with a solemnity which befitted the occasion, not to deliver an oration, but formally to dedicate the grounds. It was a sad hour. Any tumultuous wave of applause would have been out of place. The entire bearing of Mr. Lincoln showed how deeply he realized the seriousness of the act. It grieved him that there were many thousands who regarded him as personally responsible for the deaths which the exercises of the day called to mind. At no time more than when he stood before the newly made graves of Gettysburg did the injustice of this charge so oppress him. His sole effort, therefore, was to convince the world of the overwhelming importance of the principle for which the war was waged and the heroes of the battle had fallen and his own life was being spent. The deep feeling of the speaker, combined with masterful self-control and firmly set purpose, made a profound impression. There was some-

thing so unusual in the tone of his voice and in his mode of address that long before those present had weighed his words, he had finished. His remarks were limited to nine sentences. The suddenness with which he ended was almost startling. The first few lines of the address were spoken without notes. Then gradually drawing them from his pocket, he held in both hands the sheet on which they were written, making emphatic gestures, not with his hands, which were preoccupied, but by bowing from side to side with his body. All told, there were only 250 words spoken, and just two minutes of time were occupied in their delivery. But rarely has the same amount of thought and argument been compressed within the same compass."

DAU.

Building the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. — "Upon Morningside Heights, on the Island of Manhattan," writes *Time* (February 2, 1925), "is slowly arising a mammoth monument — Gloria Dei, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. In a city where there is many a fine towering pile erected to Mammon much has been made of the millions that have been spent, and the millions that have yet to be spent, in giving Manhattan what London, Aachen, Paris, Reims, Wien, Milano, Roma, Seville, have long had—a magnificent cathedral. At the beginning of the past week, Bishop William T. Manning, D. D., LL. D., sent out an army of church-workers into cold streets and hot offices of the great city. They solicited United States dollars and cents in the brave hope of collecting \$10,900,000, which is to complete the \$15,000,000 fund for the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. . . . Canon Pritchard, Acting Dean of the Cathedral, blessed the workers and said: 'The time has come for us to give up letter-writing and telephoning and to go and get our men.'" Among those who gave was Publisher Adolph S. Ochs of the *New York Times*. In a letter to the bishop he wrote: "My dear Bishop Manning: If it fits in with its architectural plan and would be acceptable to the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, I should be pleased to contribute two seven-branched candelabra, to be in size and form a bronze facsimile of the *Menorah*, which, as you know, was a feature of Solomon's Temple. I make this offer in the hope that it may be regarded as an appropriate gift from one of the Jewish faith who wishes to be among those contributing to the establishment of your great cathedral as a civic monument dedicated to the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and as an expression that spirituality has an abiding place in the great community. In addition to the gift of the candelabra I shall be pleased to subscribe ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) to your building fund; and I also wish to assure you of the sympathy of the *New York Times* and its purpose to aid enthusiastically in securing the \$15,000,000 fund." "J. P. Morgan & Co., as a firm, donated \$20,000 (one-tenth of the bankers' quota). Henry Unglaub, age insignificant, sent three cents, his whole fortune, with a letter: 'Dear Bishop: I am a little boy, and my name is Henry. I want to send all my money to help build the big church.'" This letter provoked a gift of \$5,000. "Mr. and Mrs. Frederick W. Vanderbilt pledged \$100,000. Ralph Pulitzer, publisher of the *New York World*, vied with Pub-

lisher Ochs and gave \$10,000. Mayor Hylan of New York City (a Catholic) sent \$100 with a long letter. Millions poured into the cathedral coffers; more dollars are on their way." — However, there has also been criticism. *America*, official organ of the United States Jesuits, writes: "No sane man would in any way contribute to the spread of disease in a community. Nor can any genuine Catholic contribute to the strengthening of any group or society pledged to teach heresy. What, it may be asked, is this Protestant cathedral for? A Catholic cathedral is the peculiar church of the prelate whom the Holy Ghost has chosen for a post of exalted dignity, trust, and authority. It represents, and as far as may be possible, actually is, a magnificent monument testifying to the divine origin of the Catholic faith. It is a mother of all the local churches. From its chair the bishop teaches, at its altar he pontificates. It is, then, the center of religion and religious authority in the diocese. 'Heresy, ever the "ape of God," attaches a similar meaning to its cathedrals.'"

MUELLER.

Prohibition and the Mass in Colorado. — Governor Morely of Colorado, elevated to his present position largely through the power of the Ku Klux Klan, recommended in his inaugural address a law forbidding the use of wine for sacramental purposes. Obedient to the governor's request, an anti-Mass bill was introduced. This same Legislature also considered a bill according to which no child-caring institution which raises money by appeals to the generosity of the public may maintain a school for its charges, but must send them to the public school. Criticizing these two bills, *America* (January 31) writes: "Neither proposal possesses the necessary elements which must be found in every law. Hence, regardless of the action of the Colorado Legislature, both are and will be null and void in the eyes of Catholics and of all men of sense. . . . There is not much danger that these bigots in Colorado will succeed in taking the orphans from the Sisters and placing them in schools where they will learn absolutely nothing of the divine Lover of their souls, our Lord Jesus Christ. There is even less danger that at the behest of an unkempt crowd, whose religion consists in nothing but hatred of the Catholic Church, the adorable sacrifice of the Mass will cease to be offered in Colorado. As the Rev. Matthew Smith, editor of the *Catholic Register*, remarks: 'It does not matter what laws they pass. We will get fermented wine for the Mass and use it. If every priest and Catholic layman in the State has to go to jail, we will still celebrate Mass.' They can send us to jail until we rot, but the Mass will be celebrated with fermented wine, and celebrated regularly. It is altogether outside the jurisdiction of the State of Colorado or of any civil government to dictate to us in regard to the Mass. This is our stand, and let our enemies make the most of it. When they step inside the sanctuary, they will find us ready to go to death rather than submit. So lay off, Governor Morely! For there is no human jurisdiction whatever which can forbid the offering of the holy sacrifice of the Mass. It is fundamental that the Federal Government may not bar, or even interfere with, its celebration."

Nor may any State, although there are vestiges in a few state constitutions of discrimination against Catholics and Catholic worship. The Mass is the central and essential act of worship of Almighty God in the Catholic Church. To proscribe the Mass is to proscribe the Church. But to admit that any jurisdiction, State or Federal, may ban the Catholic Church is to admit that it may ban any form of religious worship. If that be true, then the religious liberty guaranteed by the Federal and state constitutions is a mere fiction. . . . The Mass, then, will be offered, Prohibition or no Prohibition."

MUELLER.

To prove that America was first discovered by Eric the Red and his Norsemen, Donald B. Macmillan, the Arctic explorer, will make studies in Newfoundland, in Labrador, and in Greenland, where "there are still standing the remainders of 180 farmhouses and twenty-five stone churches" of the Lost Colony. He thinks that "in them probably lies the first chapter of American history." The Catholic *Commonweal* (February 4) suggests that Macmillan study the archives of the Vatican; for those Nordics who are supposed to have discovered America before the Surdic Columbus must have been Catholics, and their discovery, if it happened, would only prove "the missionary enterprise of the Catholic Church and the beginning of its civilizing influence on America." Spite of this Catholic application of cold water to Macmillan's plan, the plan should be executed, inclusive of the study of the Vatican archives. There will be time enough later to discuss the value of the results achieved by the investigation.

DAU.

A strange attempt was made by the *Vaudeville News* of December 26, 1924, to show to the world how much the National Vaudeville Artists' Association and the Vaudeville Managers' Protective Association think of the teachings of Jesus Christ. Amid illustrations taken from theatrical life instances were related how by deeds of kindness and helpfulness members of the theatrical profession of the vaudeville class apply the teachings of "the Savior of Mankind." From a letter of E. F. Albee, of the Vaudeville Exchange, New York, to a reclaimed drunkard the following passage was quoted: "It [your reclamation] brings back Jesus Christ's saying: 'I say unto you that joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance.' Pray to Him for strength to continue your resolution and remember that Christ died for the redemption of mankind. Believe in Him, follow His teachings, which are simple and beautiful, and you will not only have done a service to yourself, but will serve others, who will be encouraged by your resolution." The same writer, in his *Christmas Greetings to Vaudeville and All Other Branches of the Theatrical Profession*, says: "One manager, in answering a letter of complaint from me, stated: 'It is generally reported that you are an evangelist; that too much reading of the Bible has turned your head.' My answer to him was: 'The report you have heard is somewhat correct. I am an evangelist for better conditions in vaudeville, and the reading of

the Bible never did aught but soften the heart, not the head, of any man.' No class of people are more charitable, more religiously inclined, than the theatrical profession." Etc. The whole effort is sickening in the extreme; for there can be no other motive for it than greed. The vaudeville world is no part of the Christian domain, and no Christian would look for professions of Christianity from that quarter. Practising vaudeville and practising Christianity is about as reasonable and proper as a symphony concert by Christ and Belial. Divine grace can indeed lay its rescuing hand even on a vaudeville wretch and unquestionably has done so in some instances. But the reclaimed could not possibly have gone back to vaudeville and stay reclaimed. This whole attempt by vaudevillians of donning Christian respectability may serve as an illustration of 2 Cor. 11, 14. Besides, it shows that the principles of Christianity can be correctly understood and even admired in circles where Christianity itself is travestied and repudiated.

DAU.

Family relations in Soviet Russia are to be regulated by a code of laws adopted by the Commissariat of Justice and submitted to the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR. The code was published in the Moscow *Izvestia* of December 21, 1924 and reproduced as follows in the *Nation* of February 4: "According to the code the marriage age for women is fixed at sixteen years and for men at eighteen years. It is forbidden to register a marriage between persons either of whom has been recognized as imbecile or is suffering from a psychic disease, between relatives on the direct ascending or descending line, between brothers and sisters. Married people may have a common family name if they so declare at the time of registration. Otherwise they retain their own family names as before marriage. When a marriage is registered between a citizen of the RSFSR and a citizen of a foreign country, both retain their citizenship. Property acquired by husband and wife during marriage (also in case of unregistered marriage) belongs to both on the basis of common ownership. If either of the parties to a marriage is in need or disabled, he has a right to claim support from the other if the latter is in a position to render the support. For the sake of protecting the interests of mother and child, a pregnant woman is given the right to register the name of the father in the local department of registration, which notifies the father. If the latter does not enter any objections in the course of two weeks, he is recognized as the father of the child. In cases where it has been established by the court that other men, besides the one pointed out by the woman, have had intimate relations with her, the court makes them liable as codefendants. The rights of parents are exercised exclusively in the interests of the children, and wherever these rights are not exercised in conformity with the principle of the law, the court may deprive the parents of their rights. All measures in regard to the children are taken with the consent of both parents. In cases of disagreement the disputed question is settled by the state organs of guardianship, with the participation of the parents. The parents

have the right to send the children to institutions for their bringing up and education. But they have no right to enter into a contract for the employment of their children without the consent of the children themselves. The duty to maintain the children is equally shared by both parents; however, the share of each of the parents in the maintenance is determined by their respective material conditions. In cases when parents are not fulfilling their duties toward the children, or when they exercise their rights against the principles of the law, as well as in cases of cruel treatment of children, the court takes the children away from the parents and hands them over to proper guardians. On the other hand, it is the duty of children to provide for their disabled and needy parents. Persons in need who cannot procure assistance from their parents, children, husbands, or wives should be supported by their relatives on the direct ascending or descending line and by brothers and sisters. Adoption is permitted only when it is in the interests of the children. If there are parents, or if the child is under guardianship, the consent of the parents or of the guardian must be secured. The adoption of minors older than ten years is not permitted without their own consent."

DAU.

Christian Character According to Charles E. Hughes. — Charles E. Hughes, the former Secretary of State, is one of the Sunday-school teachers in Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., the church where the late President, Warren G. Harding, worshiped. Recently Mr. Hughes delivered an address before a Bible class of this church which had just completed its annual banquet. In part he said: "Any institution or organization, any cult or system, which tries to bind the restless spirit of man, to set bounds to his curious searchings, to deny the report of his reason, cannot last. The Master came that we might have life, and that we might have it more abundantly. We must have its joy, its untiring pursuits, its fresh victories." He then proceeded: "A truly Christian character is revealed in a balanced life. Many years ago I attempted to suggest to you its quality. Let me repeat what I then said, for it sums up what I would always have in the minds of those who are trying to live abundantly and well. What does the Christian character, or balanced life, mean? It is this: Faith without credulity, conviction without bigotry, charity without condescension, courage without pugnacity, self-respect without vanity, humility without obsequiousness, love of humanity without sentimentality, and meekness with power. That is our ideal."

Whether this report, which is given in *Time* (March 2), mentions the essential features of Mr. Hughes's address, or whether important parts have been omitted, we are not able to decide. If he has been substantially quoted, we deeply regret that Mr. Hughes did not point out the all-important work of Christ in the formation of Christian character. Christian character involves much more than Mr. Hughes mentions. It presupposes true faith in the divine Redeemer of the world, without whom there is no building of true Christian character. The statement: "Any institution or organiza-

tion, any cult or system, which tries to bind the restless spirit of man, to set bounds to his curious searchings, to deny the report of his reason, cannot last," is historically and religiously incorrect. It is the express will of God that "the restless spirit of man" should be bound by God's Word, and the history of the Christian Church proves that an organization which so binds the restless spirit of man does last. Mr. Hughes seems to have forgotten the historical fact that the Christian Church has lasted for nineteen centuries. MUELLER.

A Christian's Attitude toward Good Government. — The *Lutheran Church Herald* (March 3, 1925) writes editorially: "Eight hundred thousand children are growing up in the city of New York without any religious instruction, and crime is increasing so that life is no longer safe. We find similar conditions in nearly all our larger cities. There are about 75,000 people in the country organized to commit crime and make it a business and livelihood. The so-called "better films" seem to be very few and far between. Many of them pretend to teach moral lessons by taking the audience on a trip through the slums of our cities, or by exhibiting the Jekyll-and-Hyde life of upper society people, and all these revolting scenes the children are invited to witness on the screen. The excuse given is that it is what people want, and if they don't want it, they can stay away. But there is no censorship, no advance information to be had, and trained lobbyists are always on hand to prevent legislation which would interfere with the business of the Jew managers. The criminal classes are organized for political action to elect men who will help them to defeat the ends of justice, if necessary. The better elements in society are divided, and kept from working together by all kinds of trivial issues which have no bearing in municipal elections. Capable business men cannot afford to run for office. They know that as soon as they become candidates, they will be subjected to all kinds of slander, which may not only ruin their business, but even deprive them of their good name. Many of the city charters are out of date, and revision is impossible because of the many warring factions. Candidates are often judged by their political affiliations, and the election becomes a party affair, although national issues have nothing to do with good municipal government. Perhaps we are rather pessimistic, but nearly everybody will admit that this description of conditions is altogether too true. The church people and the better element in society should take a more active part in city elections and not leave everything to the bootleggers, grafters, and 'the underworld.' The Christian also has his duties to the state and should take interest in its welfare. He should try to find out the truth about issues and candidates and go to the polls and vote for better government and the best candidates." MUELLER.

Self-administration and undisturbed religious and economic liberty was promised to German Tyrol when it was annexed, "solely on strategic grounds," by Italy. Now the Italians are working vigorously and ruthlessly for the absolute elimination of the German language in Tyrol. "Hardest infliction of all on the devout:

religious instruction is also given only in the Italian language," says Lillian Frobenius-Eagle, who has recently made a study of the country. This is another of the many signs showing that the object of the Allied warfare upon Germany was the application of the old Roman formula: *Ceterum censeo*, etc. DAU.

A Call for the Best Hymns.—The *Watchman-Examiner* (February 26) has the following editorial on a subject which must ever be important to the Church: "Dr. David Bishop, of Liverpool, England, is undertaking to have his people educated in the singing of the best hymns. He is having a series of hymn-singing rehearsals. He says: 'In the cathedral we ought not to use any hymns which are not of the very best. We are surrounded by magnificent art and craftsmanship, and we have no business to be offering as praise to God anything mean or tawdry in music or words.' Certainly there is ample room for improvement in the music of the churches in America. The old hymns of the Church are little used by the people. And yet, if they are instructed in them, the people come to delight in them. The fault doubtless is in the church leaders. Pastors and choir leaders have indulged the notion that the music hall style of hymn music is all that the masses can appreciate. But the very best there is in sacred music is not beyond the appreciation of the people. A diligent use of it in our services of worship would refine the taste and improve the worship." MUELLER.

"The Trend to Romanism."—"Several of the Protestant Episcopal churches in New York show a decided disposition to adopt Romanist habits. Mass has been celebrated in several of them for many years. Now it is announced that receptacles for holy water will be placed just inside the front doors of the church of St. Mary the Virgin on Forty-sixth Street, near Broadway. St. Mary's is the third Episcopal church to take such a step. St. Ignatius's Church, in the Borough of Manhattan, and St. Paul's, in the Borough of Brooklyn, have had holy water at the church-doors for some time. St. Mary the Virgin's has used holy water up to this time only for the blessing of wedding-rings, for funerals, and for the dedication and consecration of furnishings. What next, and where will the end be?" Where the end will be, is not difficult to say. For the one wing in the Protestant Episcopal Church it will be Roman Catholicism; for the other it will be the rankest form of Modernism. A few elect will, nevertheless, cling to Christ's Gospel also within the Protestant Episcopal Church. MUELLER.

"The Christian Cynosure."—That the *Christian Cynosure*, published by the National Christian Association, 850 W. Madison St., Station C, Chicago, Ill., is being widely read, also in our circles, is apparent from the many letters which we have received. Some of the best articles are written by Lutheran ministers, who are glad to take this opportunity to testify against lodges, also outside of our Church. The last number (March, 1925) of this periodical announces that until April 30 it will enter subscriptions for three months for 25 cents. "If a pastor secures an agent who shall secure ten full-

year subscriptions for the *Christian Cynosure*," he will receive the magazine free for one year, and the agent will be allowed a liberal commission. This number also contains a cartoon which strikingly brings to view the ungodly unionism of lodgism. This cartoon may prove useful in showing lodge-members what the lodge really is.

MUELLER.

The Best Method of Catholic Propaganda.—In an article on this subject the Catholic weekly *America* (January 24) writes among other things: "In no part of the world is the need for Catholic propaganda so acute as it is here. And perhaps in no part of the world are Catholics so little alive to the need for the right sort of propaganda. The American Catholic population of 20,000,000 should be in a position to strike most effectively on behalf of their religion. It is true that Catholics are less unified here than elsewhere for concerted action, owing to the diversity of races among them; but the rest of America is religiously an amorphous mass, into which a hard wedge could be more easily driven than is generally supposed. Yet we seem to be content with holding our own, and, so long as we are left in peace to practise our religion, with accepting as part of the order of the universe the state of affairs around us. . . . There could hardly be a moment more favorable to Catholic action. The theological modernism of so many Protestants, like the skeptical paganism almost universal among our intellectuals, are indications—clearer to us who receive them than to those who give them—of a profound dissatisfaction with the existing traditions. Could we seize this moment, the day would be ours. But our propaganda, when there is any of it, is ineffectual in reaching men in any numbers and, except in rare instances, does not seem to affect the first-rate minds that the Church in Europe has been successful in drawing to herself. . . . Though we have no need to be ashamed of contrasting the character and conduct of our people with those of any religious group in America; though we know that the world has long been dimly aware that it has to go to the Catholic Church to find a saint; though we may confidently say that, just as respectability is the talent of Protestantism, holiness is the genius of Catholicism, we still have a long way to go before we can be proud of our intellectual eminence. Our intellectual position is another matter—that is unassailable; but our grasp and exposition of that position is, apart from our priesthood, lamentably weak. Few Catholics can explain, much less defend, their religion; and until we get Catholic laymen capable of, and eager for, such exposition, we shall not make much headway. Meanwhile our priests have their time in the pulpit fully occupied with elementary things, with preventing the simplest sentences in the catechism from fading from the minds of their flocks. We cannot expect them to do the wider work that so urgently needs to be done. . . . One more point, perhaps the most important of all those I have raised, remains to be dealt with. Even had we large numbers of Catholics capable of expounding their faith, expert dialecticians, it would not be enough. They might irritate by too great an insistence and appear to be prigs and bores, alienating those whom they

would convince. We need not so much men with all the arguments at their finger-tips as men with the whole content of the faith mixed with their hearts and firing their imaginations. Such men would draw by charity rather than compel by controversy. They would speak of religion not merely in terms of cold logic, but of intimate experience. And the world, addressed in such terms by such men, would be won, as poetry wins the soul by its own unargued, but irresistible proofs. The thing experienced would be seen at the first flash to be lovely truth, and thousands, now ignorant of the Church's teaching, or blind, would realize that they had heard their mother speaking. They would recognize, as from some prenatal dream, the tones of her voice and, charmed by her beauty, run to her waiting arms."

MUELLER.

The Radio Phone as a Missionary Agent.—Under this heading J. L. Bouscaren, S. J., writes: "Since March, 1924, the Theological Department of Saint Louis University, falling in with this general movement, has been conducting regular courses of instruction in Catholic truth by radio phone. The university had, for some time previous, been equipped with an excellent broadcasting station, which was in charge of Brother George Rueppel, S. J. This station, installed in 1910, had been of great service to the Government during the war as a school for the training of radio operators for the United States Signal Corps. Reestablished in 1919, after the removal of war restrictions, it had soon advanced to a very high stage of peace service through the establishment, in April, 1921, of a radio telephone for the transmission of United States Weather Bureau reports and market and crop estimates. Why should not this same equipment be now pressed into the service of Christ and used to proclaim His divine message? . . . The lectures were sent broadcast on Sunday afternoons at 2 o'clock during March, April, and May, 1924. Some of the subjects treated were: The Divine Origin of the Church, The Marks of the Church, The Infallibility of the Pope, The Sacraments, The Priesthood, Confession, The Holy Eucharist, and Marriage. The lectures were generously reported by the daily press, a circumstance which not only gave wider currency to the instructions, but also advertised the fact that they were being given. It had been announced at the opening of the course that questions addressed to the Radio Department of the university would receive attention on the last Sunday of each month. The questions came. Some of them were friendly in tone; others were evidently put in a challenging and hostile spirit; but all were courteously answered in three special radio talks by Rev. D. A. Lord, S. J. This question-and-answer method was found to be one of the best features of the plan, for several reasons. In the first place, one who asks a question is pretty likely to listen for an answer. And then, 'a soft answer turneth away wrath.' Nothing disarms hostility so perfectly as the courtesy and moderation of an answer to an angry question; it cools the fire as water quenches the glow of red-hot metal. Besides, the answer is an opportunity for the lecturer to explain obscure points and to enlarge upon the matter of the original talk. . . . The work is being continued this year.

From November 2 to December 21, 1924, eight lectures were delivered by Fathers who are in their fourth year of study, and twenty-seven more potential lecturers of the same class remain to finish the work of the scholastic year. Besides these, it should be added that the Rev. James J. O'Regan, S. J., who delivered the Sunday evening sermons in the Church of St. Francis Xavier during Advent, also repeated each of them by radio phone on the following Tuesday evening. . . . Has the radio any advantages as an apostolic agent over the written and spoken word? . . . Chief among them is the fact that it reaches people, Catholic, Protestant, and unbelieving, who either will not enter a Catholic church nor read Catholic literature at all, or at any rate are not in a position to get in any other way the instruction which they are willing to accept through this medium. There are also curious chance listeners, who offer many opportunities for the seed to fall upon good ground. Certainly, since so many Protestant pulpits are now broadcasting, it would seem remiss on our part to leave this new field entirely uncultivated. Finally, experience has shown that, provided the message be simple, direct, and interesting, it will not be wasted on the desert air."

MUELLER.

BOOK REVIEW.

Synodical Reports: *Southern Illinois District.* Tenth report. 58 pages; 30 cts. — *Western District.* Fifty-first report. 31 pages; 15 cts. — *Kansas District.* Twenty-fifth report. 52 pages; 27 cts. — *Texas District.* Thirteenth report. 64 pages. 30 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The report of the Southern Illinois District contains a German essay on "The Necessity of Sanctification" by the Rev. J. F. Boerger. The report of the Western District contains a German essay on "Jesus Christ, the One, Eternal High Priest" by the Rev. Th. Laetsch and an English essay on "Present-day Dangers Threatening Our Spiritual and Congregational Life" by the Rev. A. P. Feddersen. The Kansas District report contains an English doctrinal essay by Prof. H. J. Stoepelwerth on "How can the Lutheran Church Serve as the True Light of the World?" The Texas District report contains a German essay by Prof. H. A. Klein on the Fifth Article of the Formula of Concord: "Of the Law and the Gospel."

FRITZ.

Miles Coverdale. By *William Dallmann.* XII and 168 pages, 4½×7; 90 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The third printing of Dallmann's *Miles Coverdale* is on the market. What the reader may expect is given in the author's prefatory note, which reads: "As English-speaking Lutherans we are, of course, interested to learn how Lutheranism came to the English. This may be shown in the life of Miles Coverdale, who lived under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Bloody Mary, and Elizabeth. He translated the Bible into English, he translated Lutheran hymns into English, he translated other Lutheran works into English. What he and others did in England four hundred years ago we must do in America to-day — put Lutheranism into English." The more

than one hundred authorities given by Pastor Dallmann show his historical trend of mind and his sincere effort to give to the reader much reliable information. FRITZ.

Leichenreden. By *C. C. Schmidt, D. D.* VI and 171 pages, 5×7½; \$1.50. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Dr. C. C. Schmidt, the venerable pastor of Holy Cross Lutheran Church, St. Louis, needs no introduction as a theologian and a preacher. His *Leichenreden* are brief and specific, as addresses at funerals should be. Usually a brief text is taken and applied. We know that pastors will thank Dr. Schmidt for this book. FRITZ.

Christian Questions. 4 pages. Price: 50 copies, 60 cts.; 100, \$1.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This is a separate print of the *Christian Questions* of our Small Catechism. It has been gotten out by request of pastors who desire to use them in admonishing members who do not frequently attend the Lord's Supper, and also those who in the course of years have gotten away from the Lutheran Church, to which at the time of their confirmation they had promised faithfulness. FRITZ.

Games and Playground Supervision for Lutheran Schools. By *A. C. Krug.* 143 pp.; \$1.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

A discussion of this book belongs in our *School Journal*, but we are glad to make the announcement of its appearance and dare say that teachers will thank the author for having compiled a list of good games for the children. FRITZ.

The Lutheran Student. Edited by *Rev. A. Haentzschel*, Madison, Wis.

For 25 cents this new publication will tell four times a year what is being done by the Student Welfare Committee and its associates to take care of the spiritual interests of our young people attending the higher institutions of learning, especially the universities of our country. The movement deserves the hearty support of Missourians, and subscribing for the *Lutheran Student* is one way of aiding the cause. DAU.

Brief Mention.

Rev. W. M. Czamanske, Sheboygan, Wis., has published **Christ is Risen**, a children's Easter service. — The Missouri Synod's Board of Missions to Brazil and Argentina has published the German sermon preached by *W. H. T. Dau* at Chicago, October 26, 1924, at the ordination of Missionary Samuel Beethmann. The text is Titus 1, 1—4. — Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church at St. Joseph, Mich. (Rev. L. Nuechterlein, pastor), has issued an artistic souvenir dedication program (*Festbuechlein*) to commemorate the dedication of its beautiful new church on March 29. — From the *Schriftenverein* (E. Klaerner, Zwickau, Saxony) has come another instalment of the eschatological paper which *Rev. J. M. Michael*, of Copenhagen, has been reading before the annual convention of the *Freikirche* during the last three years. This instalment, we believe, concludes the series; the title is: **Von der Auferstehung der Toten, dem Juengsten Gericht und dem Weltende.** 39 pages. Equally valuable is the tract by *Rev. Heinrich Stallmann*: **Die Internationale Vereinigung ernster Bibelforscher**, a review of Russellism (32 pages), and the tract by *Rev. Albert Huebener*: **Eine Ermunterung zur Treue im Hausgottesdienst** (31 pages). DAU.